## **Remarks**

Reconsideration and reexamination of the above-identified patent application, as amended, are respectfully requested. Claims 2-6 and 8-14 are pending in this application upon entry of this Amendment. In this Amendment, the Applicant has amended claims 2-6 and 8-13; cancelled claims 1 and 7; and added new claim 14. Of the pending claims, claims 2, 8, and 13-14 are the only independent claims.

## **Specification**

In the Office Action mailed May 21, 2004, the Examiner objected to the specification for an informality on line 27 of page 7 of the specification. The Applicant has amended the specification accordingly.

## Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner objected to claims 2, 8, and 12 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but indicated that these claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 2 depends from independent claim 1. The Applicant has rewritten claim 2 in independent form including all of the limitations of independent claim 1. The Applicant has amended claims 3-6 to depend from amended independent claim 2. Accordingly, claims 2-6, as amended, are in a condition for allowance.

Claim 8 depends from independent claim 1; and claim 12 depends from claim 8. The Applicant has rewritten claim 8 in independent form including all of the limitations of independent claim 7. The Applicant has amended claims 9-11 to depend from amended independent claim 8. Accordingly, claims 8-12, as amended, are in a condition for allowance.

S/N: 10/755,493 Reply to Office Action of May 21, 2004

The Applicant has amended independent claim 13 to correspond to amended independent claim 2. As such, amended independent claim 13 is believed to be in a condition for allowance.

The Applicant has added new independent claim 14 to correspond to amended independent claim 8. As such, newly added independent claim 14 is believed to be in a condition for allowance.

## Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 7, and 13 and dependent claims 5-6 and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 3,668,407 issued to Matzen et al. ("Matzen"). The Examiner rejected independent claims 1, 7, and 13 and dependent claims 3, 5-6, 9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,371,359 issued to Hagiuda et al. ("Hagiuda").

As indicated above, the Applicant has cancelled independent claims 1 and 7 and has amended independent claim 13 to be in a condition for allowance. Claims 5-6 and 11 depend from one of amended independent claims 2 and 8 and include the limitations therein. Thus, the rejection to the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) is now moot.

The Applicant does not acquiesce to the rejection of independent claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) in view of either Matzen or Hagiuda. However, the Applicant has cancelled independent claims 1 and 7 and has amended independent claim 13 in order to put this patent application into a condition for allowance. The Applicant reserves the right to prosecute claims that are identical or similar to the claims being cancelled and amended herein in any continuing patent applications related to this patent application.

Atty Dkt No. KOA 0244 PUS (R 1421)

S/N: 10/755,493

Reply to Office Action of May 21, 2004

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected dependent claims 4 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Hagiuda in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,495,832 issued to Kirby. This

rejection is now moot because as indicated above, claims 4 and 10, as amended, are in a

condition for allowance.

**CONCLUSION** 

In summary, claims 2-6 and 8-13, as amended, and newly added claim 14 meet

the substantive requirements for patentability. The case is in appropriate condition for

allowance. Accordingly, such action is respectfully requested.

If a telephone or video conference would expedite allowance or resolve any

further questions, such a conference is invited at the convenience of the Examiner.

Respeatfully submitted,

GREGOR BOEHNE

James N. Kallis Reg. No. 41,102

Attorney for Applicant

Date: May 25, 2004

**BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.** 

1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor

Southfield, MI 48075-1238 Phone: 248-358-4400

Fax: 248-358-3351